

EXHIBIT 18

ERIC D. MASON (State Bar No. 259233)
Eric.Mason@aporter.com
ARNOLD & PORTER LLP
777 South Figueroa Street, 44th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017-5844
Telephone: (213) 243-4000
Facsimile: (213) 243-4199

LOUIS S. EDERER (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Louis.Ederer@aporter.com
MATTHEW T. SALZMANN (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Matthew.Salzmann@aporter.com
LAURA W. TEJEDA (*Pro Hac Vice*)
Laura.Tejada@aporter.com
ARNOLD & PORTER LLP
399 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10022
Telephone: (212) 715-1000
Facsimile: (212) 715-1399

Attorneys for Defendants
Louise Paris, Ltd. and Rainbow USA, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STANDARD FABRICS
INTERNATIONAL, INC., a California
corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

LOUISE PARIS, LTD., a New York
limited liability company; RAINBOW
USA, INC., a New York Corporation;
DOES 1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: CV15-03495 (PSG) (FFMx)

Hon. Philip S. Gutierrez

**LOUISE PARIS, LTD.'S RESPONSES
AND OBJECTIONS TO STANDARD
FABRICS INTERNATIONAL, INC.'S
FIRST SET OF
INTERROGATORIES**

Defendant Louise Paris, Ltd. ("Louise Paris"), by and through its undersigned attorneys, hereby responds to Plaintiff Standard Fabrics International, Inc. ("Plaintiff")'s First Set of Interrogatories (the "Interrogatories") as follows:

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Louise Paris makes the following General Objections to Plaintiff's Interrogatories, which apply to each Interrogatory regardless of whether the General Objections are expressly incorporated into the specific objections below:

1. Louise Paris objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they seek to impose obligations that exceed those under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the Local Civil Rules.

2. Louise Paris objects to the Interrogatories on the basis that they contain multiple discrete sub-parts and therefore exceed the number of interrogatories permitted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1).

3. Louise Paris objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they may unfairly seek to restrict the facts Louise Paris may rely on at trial, or to the extent that they require Louise Paris to analyze or formulate contentions on matters for which Louise Paris' investigation and discovery have not yet been completed. Since discovery has not been completed, Louise Paris is not yet necessarily in possession of all the facts and documents upon which Louise Paris intends to rely. Louise Paris reserves the right to supplement, amend, or modify these responses at a future date.

4. Louise Paris objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they seek information that is not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. To the extent that Louise Paris responds to these Interrogatories, it does not concede that the information sought or disclosed is relevant to this litigation.

5. Louise Paris objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they are vague, overly broad or unduly burdensome.

6. Louise Paris objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they seek

1 information that is privileged or exempt from discovery under the attorney-client
2 privilege, work product doctrine, or other privilege or exemption under applicable
3 law. Louise Paris does not waive, and intends to preserve, and is preserving all
4 applicable privileges or protections with respect to any information protected by such
5 a privilege or protection. In the event that any privileged or protected information is
6 disclosed, such disclosure is inadvertent and will not constitute a waiver of any
7 privilege or protection.

8 7. Louise Paris objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they fail to
9 specify a relevant time period. The absence of a limited time period makes these
10 Interrogatories overly broad and unduly burdensome in scope.

11 8. Louise Paris' responses to the Interrogatories are made to the best of
12 Louise Paris' present knowledge, information and belief. Said responses are at all
13 times subject to such additional or different information that discovery or further
14 investigation may disclose and, while based on the present state of Louise Paris'
15 recollection, are subject to such refreshing of recollection, and such additional
16 knowledge of facts, as may result from Louise Paris' further discovery or
17 investigation. Louise Paris reserves the right to make use of, or to introduce at any
18 hearing or trial, information responsive to the Interrogatories but discovered
19 subsequent to the date of these responses, including, but not limited to, any such
20 information obtained in discovery herein.

21 9. Louise Paris objects to the Interrogatories on the basis that fact discovery
22 is ongoing, and expressly reserves the right to amend its responses to the
23 Interrogatories if and when additional information becomes available.

24 10. Louise Paris preserves its objections as to the competency, relevance,
25 materiality, privilege and admissibility of any information provided in response to
26 these Interrogatories. Louise Paris also expressly reserves the right to object to
27 further discovery into the subject matter of the Interrogatories and to the introduction
28 into of evidence of any responses to the Interrogatories.

1 11. Louise Paris' responses to the Interrogatories shall not be interpreted to
2 concede the truth of any factual assertion or implication contained in the
3 Interrogatories.

4 12. Louise Paris objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they seek
5 information set forth in documents that are outside Louise Paris' possession, custody
6 or control.

7 13. Louise Paris objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they seek
8 information that Plaintiff equally may otherwise obtain from public sources or with
9 less burden and expense by using other means of discovery.

10 14. Louise Paris objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they are
11 cumulative, duplicative, repetitive, or overlapping.

12 15. Louise Paris reserves the right to object on any ground at any time to
13 such other or supplemental interrogatories as Plaintiff may propound involving or
14 relating to the subject matter of these Interrogatories.

15 16. Louise Paris objects to the defined terms "Identify" and "Identity" on the
16 grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome.

17 17. Louise Paris objects to the use of the defined term "Subject Product" on
18 the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous and purports to require Louise Paris to
19 make a legal conclusion as to what may or may not be "substantially similar" to the
20 "Subject Design".

21 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORIES**

22 **INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

23 IDENTIFY all witnesses with knowledge or information concerning YOUR
24 obtainment or creation of SUBJECT DESIGNS and/or purchase, distribution, or sale
25 of SUBJECT PRODUCT.

26 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

27 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
28 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis

1 that the terms “obtainment”, “creation” and “witnesses” are vague and ambiguous as
2 used therein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it is
3 overly broad and unduly burdensome in scope in that it seeks the identification of “all
4 witnesses” with knowledge or information concerning Louise Paris’ “obtainment or
5 creation” of the “Subject Designs” and/or the “purchase, distribution, or sale” of
6 “Subject Product”. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that
7 it contains multiple discrete sub-parts that render Plaintiff’s total Interrogatories in
8 excess of the twenty-five (25) interrogatory limit set forth in Federal Rule of Civil
9 Procedure 33(a)(1).

10 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris
11 identifies the following individuals: Melissa Tomala, Designer, Louise Paris, Ltd.;
12 and Serkan Ozgun, Controller-Accounting Department, Louise Paris, Ltd. Ms.
13 Velazquez and Mr. Ozgun may be contacted through Louise Paris’ undersigned
14 counsel.

15 **INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

16 Describe in detail how YOU developed SUBJECT DESIGNS, including
17 without limitation the date on which YOU developed SUBJECT DESIGNS, the
18 IDENTIFYing the PERSON(s) involved in the development of the design, and the
19 specific steps that were taken to develop SUBJECT DESIGNS.

20 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

21 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
22 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
23 that the terms and/or phrases “describe in detail”, “develop”, “developed”,
24 “development”, and “specific steps” are vague and ambiguous as used therein.
25 Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it contains multiple
26 discrete sub-parts that render Plaintiff’s total Interrogatories in excess of the twenty-
27 five (25) interrogatory limit set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1).
28

1 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states
2 that its in-house team of designers, including Melissa Tomala, created the Subject
3 Designs, and that such designers used certain prints found on third-party garments as
4 inspiration in creating the Subject Designs.

5 **INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

6 Describe in detail the manner in which YOU obtained SUBJECT DESIGNS,
7 including without limitation, the date on which YOU received the design, the identity
8 of the PERSON(s) that provided the design to YOU, and any and all representations
9 that were made in regard to ownership or authorization to use SUBJECT DESIGNS

10 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

11 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
12 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
13 that the term “obtained” is vague and ambiguous as used therein. Defendant further
14 objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it contains multiple discrete sub-parts
15 that render Plaintiff’s total Interrogatories in excess of the twenty-five (25)
16 interrogatory limit set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1).

17 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris refers to
18 its response to Interrogatory No. 2.

19 **INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

20 Describe YOUR purchase of any and all SUBJECT PRODUCT, indicating the
21 dates on which YOU purchased SUBJECT PRODUCT, how much YOU paid for
22 SUBJECT PRODUCT, how many units or yards of SUBJECT PRODUCT YOU
23 purchased, and IDENTIFY the PERSON(s) that provided SUBJECT PRODUCT to
24 YOU.

25 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

26 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
27 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
28 that the term “describe” is vague and ambiguous as used therein. Louise Paris further

1 objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks confidential information of Louise
2 Paris or its business partners. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the
3 basis that it contains multiple discrete sub-parts that render Plaintiff's total
4 Interrogatories in excess of the twenty-five (25) interrogatory limit set forth in
5 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1).

6 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states
7 that it will produce non-privileged documents, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
8 Procedure 33(d), from which the Answer to this Interrogatory may be determined,
9 following the entry of an appropriate protective order.

10 **INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

11 Describe in detail the instances in which YOU approved samples of SUBJECT
12 PRODUCT, including without limitation, the date on which YOU received the
13 samples, YOUR feedback in regard to same, the response to YOUR feedback, and the
14 revisions that were made to SUBJECT PRODUCT.

15 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

16 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
17 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
18 that the terms and/or phrases "describe in detail", "approved samples", "feedback"
19 and "revisions" are vague and ambiguous as used therein. Louise Paris further
20 objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it contains multiple discrete sub-parts
21 that render Plaintiff's total Interrogatories in excess of the twenty-five (25)
22 interrogatory limit set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1). Louise Paris
23 further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it seeks information that is
24 neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
25 evidence, as Plaintiff's claim relate to the "Subject Designs" that appear on the
26 "Subject Products", and not the "Subject Products" themselves.

1 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states
 2 that it is unaware of its receipt of any samples of "Subject Products" bearing the
 3 "Subject Designs".

4 **INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

5 IDENTIFY any and all PERSON(s) who allege to have independently created
 6 or otherwise have rights in SUBJECT DESIGNS, and detail the grounds for any such
 7 assertion, including the date of any alleged independent creation.

8 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

9 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
 10 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
 11 that the phrases "independently created or otherwise have rights in" and "independent
 12 creation" are vague and ambiguous as used therein. Louise Paris further objects to
 13 this Interrogatory on the basis that it calls for a legal conclusion. Louise Paris further
 14 objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it contains multiple discrete sub-parts
 15 that render Plaintiff's total Interrogatories in excess of the twenty-five (25)
 16 interrogatory limit set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1).

17 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, refers to its response
 18 to Interrogatory No. 2.

19 **INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

20 Describe any and all agreement(s), which may include, but are not limited to,
 21 licenses, assignments, or work-for-hire agreement(s), that YOU allege provide YOU
 22 with the right to use SUBJECT DESIGNS in commerce, including without limitation,
 23 by IDENTIFYing the parties to the agreement(s), stating the date(s) on which YOU
 24 entered into the agreement(s), and, stating what consideration was tendered in
 25 connection with the agreement(s).

26 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

27 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
 28 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis

that the term “describe” is vague and ambiguous as used therein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it improperly implies that Louise Paris required the authorization, permission or consent of any party to purchase and sell garments bearing the “Subject Designs”. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it contains multiple discrete sub-parts that render Plaintiff’s total Interrogatories in excess of the twenty-five (25) interrogatory limit set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1).

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states that it unaware of the existence of any responsive agreements, and further states that it does not believe that any such agreement was or is required for it to use the “Subject Designs” that its team of in-house designers created.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8:

Detail YOUR sales(s) of SUBJECT PRODUCT, indicating the dates on which YOU sold SUBJECT PRODUCT, the amount of SUBJECT PRODUCT YOU sold, and IDENTIFY all PERSON(s) to which YOU sold SUBJECT PRODUCT.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8:

Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that the term “detail” is vague and ambiguous as used therein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it contains multiple discrete sub-parts that render Plaintiff’s total Interrogatories in excess of the twenty-five (25) interrogatory limit set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1).

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris provides the following details regarding its sales of “Subject Product”:

Date of Customer PO	Number of Units	Customer
October 23, 2014	1,800	Rainbow USA, Inc. (“Rainbow”)
October 28, 2014	2,400	Rainbow
February 18, 2015	1,116	Rainbow
March 20, 2015	210	Rainbow

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

2 State any and all different garment types (i.e. skirts, blouses, shirts, etc.) that
3 YOU have manufactured and/or sold which incorporate SUBJECT DESIGN.

4 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

5 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
6 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
7 that the phrase “garment types” is vague and ambiguous as used therein. Louise Paris
8 further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it seeks information that is
9 neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
10 evidence.

11 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states
12 that it has sold “shorts” and “pants” that bear the “Subject Designs”.

13 **INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

14 State all colorways in which YOU sold SUBJECT PRODUCT.

15 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

16 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
17 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
18 that the term “colorways” is vague and ambiguous as used therein. Louise Paris
19 further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it seeks information that is
20 neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
21 evidence.

22 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states
23 that it sold the “Subject Products” in the following colorways: “Violet Multi”; “Aqua
24 Tribal”; and “Aqua Taupe”.

25 **INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

26 Provide all SKU numbers and/or style numbers that YOU used to identify
27 SUBJECT PRODUCT.
28

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 11:

Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as if fully set forth herein.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states that it used the following style numbers to identify the "Subject Products": 93066J11EFGPKR; 51348J11EVCPKS; 51348J11PVCCKS; and 51348M11PVCCKS.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12:

State the period of time in which YOU were selling SUBJECT PRODUCT, including without limitation, the date on which YOU first made a sale of SUBJECT PRODUCT, and the date on which YOU made YOUR last sale of SUBJECT PRODUCT.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 12:

Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it contains multiple discrete sub-parts that render Plaintiff's total Interrogatories in excess of the twenty-five (25) interrogatory limit set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1).

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states that it received its first order for "Subject Products" on October 23, 2014, and that it sent its last invoice in connection with its sale of "Subject Product" on March 23, 2015.

INTERROGATORY NO. 13:

State each and every price point at which YOU sold SUBJECT PRODUCT.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 13:

Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that the phrase "price point" is vague and ambiguous as used therein. Louise Paris

1 further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it seeks information that is
 2 neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
 3 evidence.

4 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states as
 5 follows: 93066J11EFGPKR (\$5.75 per unit); 51348J11EVCPKS (\$3.50 per unit);
 6 51348J11PVCPKS (\$3.50 per unit); and 51348M11PVCPKS (\$4.00 per unit).

7 **INTERROGATORY NO. 14:**

8 Provide the total revenues derived by YOU from the sale of SUBJECT
 9 PRODUCT, indicating the amount paid by each customer for SUBJECT PRODUCT.

10 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 14:**

11 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
 12 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
 13 that the phrase "total revenues" is vague and ambiguous as used therein. Louise Paris
 14 further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it seeks information that is
 15 neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
 16 evidence.

17 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states
 18 that it will produce non-privileged documents, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
 19 Procedure 33(d), from which the Answer to this Interrogatory may be determined,
 20 following the entry of an appropriate protective order.

21 **INTERROGATORY NO. 15:**

22 Detail and describe how and why the profits that resulted from YOUR sale of
 23 SUBJECT PRODUCT should be apportioned among factors other than SUBJECT
 24 DESIGN, providing all bases for the apportionment, indicating a numerical value in
 25 connection with any factors other than SUBJECT DESIGNS that YOU believe
 26 resulted in sales of SUBJECT PRODUCT.

27 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 15:**

28 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as

1 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
 2 that the phrase “detail and describe” is vague and ambiguous as used therein. Louise
 3 Paris further objects on the grounds that this Interrogatory is grossly premature, in
 4 that Plaintiff has not yet established that it actually owns any protectable interest in or
 5 to “Plaintiff’s Designs” or that the “Subject Designs” infringe upon any such rights,
 6 and discovery has just commenced. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory
 7 on the basis that it contains multiple discrete sub-parts that render Plaintiff’s total
 8 Interrogatories in excess of the twenty-five (25) interrogatory limit set forth in
 9 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1).

10 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states
 11 that it anticipates that discovery will establish that the “Subject Designs” were just
 12 one of many factors that contributed to the sale of “Subject Products” (each of which
 13 was sold in an assortment of designs, only one of which is alleged to infringe
 14 Plaintiff’s Designs), including, without limitation, the cut or style of the “Subject
 15 Products”, the brand name(s) under which the “Subject Products” were offered for
 16 sale and sold, and the price point at which the “Subject Product” were offered for
 17 sale.

18 **INTERROGATORY NO. 16:**

19 IDENTIFY each and every deductible expense that YOU incurred in selling
 20 SUBJECT PRODUCT by stating (a) the nature of the expense, (b) the amount of the
 21 expense, (c) to whom the expense was incurred , (d) how the expense relates to the
 22 sale of SUBJECT PRODUCT, (e) when and how the expense was paid for, and (f)
 23 identifying what DOCUMENTS exist that show or reflect each specific expense.

24 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 16:**

25 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
 26 if fully set forth herein: Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
 27 that it seeks information that is not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the
 28 discovery of admissible evidence, in that it seeks information relating to “how” an

1 expense was paid, among other things. Louise Paris further objects to this
2 Interrogatory on the basis that it contains multiple discrete sub-parts that render
3 Plaintiff's total Interrogatories in excess of the twenty-five (25) interrogatory limit set
4 forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1).

5 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states
6 that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d), it will produce documents
7 sufficient to identify the information requested by this Interrogatory, following the
8 entry of an appropriate protective order.

9 **INTERROGATORY NO. 17:**

10 IDENTIFY all PERSONs, including but not limited to any and all printing
11 mills, textile factories, and sewing houses, which were in any way involved in
12 manufacturing SUBJECT PRODUCT into finished products such as garments and
13 detail the involvement of each PERSON.

14 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17:**

15 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
16 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
17 that the term and/or phrase "detail" and "in any way involved" are vague and
18 ambiguous as used therein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the
19 basis that it contains multiple discrete sub-parts that render Plaintiff's total
20 Interrogatories in excess of the twenty-five (25) interrogatory limit set forth in
21 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1).

22 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states
23 that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d), it will produce documents
24 sufficient to identify the information requested by this Interrogatory, following the
25 entry of an appropriate protective order.

26 **INTERROGATORY NO. 18:**

27 IDENTIFY all piece good vendors, fabric suppliers, manufacturers, mills,
28 design houses, and converters, both domestic and international that have provided

1 YOU sample production fabric or sample garments over the past five (5) years.

2 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 18:**

3 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
4 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
5 that it seeks information that is not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the
6 discovery of admissible evidence, in that it seeks information relating to any "sample
7 production fabric" or "sample garments", and is not limited to the "Subject Designs"
8 that are the subject of this action.

9 **INTERROGATORY NO. 19:**

10 IDENTIFY and describe any and all textile designs that YOU allege are
11 substantially similar to PLAINTIFF'S DESIGNS and pre-date PLAINTIFF'S
12 DESIGNS, including without limitation the source for said designs and the alleged
13 date such designs were created.

14 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 19:**

15 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
16 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
17 that the term "describe" is vague and ambiguous as used therein. Louise Paris further
18 objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion. Louise Paris
19 further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that Plaintiff has not disclosed
20 information necessary for Louise Paris to be in a position to respond to this
21 Interrogatory, in that Plaintiff has not identified the purported creation date of
22 "Plaintiff's Designs".

23 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states
24 that it is not aware of any designs, including, without limitation, the "Subject
25 Designs" that are "substantially similar" to "Plaintiff's Designs".

26 **INTERROGATORY NO. 20:**

27 State the amount or number of units or yards of SUBJECT PRODUCT that
28 YOU currently have in YOUR possession, custody or control.

1 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 20:**

2 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
3 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
4 that it is incomprehensible, as the "Subject Product" does not come in yards.

5 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states
6 that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d), it will produce documents
7 sufficient to identify the information requested by this Interrogatory, following the
8 entry of an appropriate protective order.

9 **INTERROGATORY NO. 21:**

10 Describe all steps taken by YOU when YOU received notice of the allegations
11 of infringement at issue in this case to investigate or remedy the alleged infringement,
12 including without limitation, IDENTIFYing any and all PERSONs that YOU
13 contacted as part of YOUR investigation.

14 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 21:**

15 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
16 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
17 that the terms and/or phrases "describe" and "all steps taken" are vague and
18 ambiguous as used therein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the
19 basis that it improperly assumes that Louise Paris engaged in any conduct that
20 required remedial action. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the
21 basis that it seeks information that is privileged or exempt from discovery under the
22 attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, or other privilege or exemption
23 under applicable law.

24 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Louise Paris states
25 that it referred the matter to outside counsel.

26 **INTERROGATORY NO. 22:**

27 Describe all instances in which YOU have been accused of copyright
28 infringement, either through a written cease and desist letter, or the filing of a civil

1 action, in the last five (5) years, including without limitation the number of times
2 YOU have been so accused, the date of the notice received by YOU of alleged
3 infringement, the disposition of the allegations, and by IDENTIFYing the party
4 making the allegations.

5 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 22:**

6 Louise Paris incorporates by reference the above-stated General Objections as
7 if fully set forth herein. Louise Paris further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis
8 that the term “describe” is vague and ambiguous as used therein. Louise Paris further
9 objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it seeks information that is not relevant
10 or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as third-
11 party accusations of infringement are irrelevant to Plaintiff’s claims.

12
13 Dated: August 31, 2015

ARNOLD & PORTER LLP

14
15 By: 

ERIC D. MASON

LOUIS S. EDERER

MATTHEW T. SALZMANN

LAURA W. TEJEDA

16
17
18
19 *Attorneys for Defendants*
20 *Louise Paris, Ltd. and*
21 *Rainbow USA, Inc.*
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Verification for Defendant Louise Paris, Ltd.'s Responses to
Plaintiff Standard Fabrics International, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories

I, Joseph Barnathan, declare:

I am the Vice President of Louise Paris, Ltd., a defendant in the above-entitled action, and I am authorized to make this verification on its behalf.

I have read the foregoing responses contained in **LOUISE PARIS, LTD.'S RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO STANDARD FABRICS INTERNATIONAL, INC.'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES** and know the contents thereof. Because the matters stated in the document identified above are a corporate response, such matters are not all necessarily within my personal knowledge or within the personal knowledge of any single individual.

Subject to these limitations, I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed in New York, New York, on this ~~26~~²⁷th day of August, 2015.



Joseph Barnathan

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 31st day of August, 2015, I served the foregoing
**LOUISE PARIS, LTD.'S RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO STANDARD
FABRICS INTERNATIONAL, INC.'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES**
on counsel the following counsel of record for Plaintiff by U.S. Mail:

Stephen M. Doniger, Esq.
Scott A. Burroughs, Esq.
Trevor W. Barrett, Esq.
DONIGER / BURROUGHS APC
603 Rose Avenue
Venice, California 90291


Matthew T. Salzmann